

File

Norman H. Bangerter, Governor Dee C. Hansen, Executive Director Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

355 W. North Temple • 3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

July 6, 1987

Mr. Andy King Genwal Coal Company P.O. Box 1201 Huntington, Utah 84528

Dear Mr. King:

Re: Response to U.S. Forest Services December 1, 1986 Comments, Tract II Lease, Genwal Coal Company, Crandall Canyon Mine, ACT/015/032, Folder No. 2, Emery County, Utah.

Enclosed is a copy of comments and concerns the Division received from the Manti-La Sal National Forest regarding the Tract 2 permit application. As previously outlined in the Division's letter to Mr. King, December 17, 1986, please deal with the Forest Service personnel directly. When their concerns have been satisfied a letter from them to us documenting such would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Susan C. Linner

Reclamation Biologist/

Permit Supervisor

pb Enclosure

cc: W. Boley, National Forest

J. Leatherwood

1232R-7

United States Department of Agriculture

Forest Service Manti-LaSal National Forest 599 West Price River Dr. Price, Utah 84501

Reply to: 2820

Date: June 22, 1987

Lowell Braxton
State of Utah Natural Resources
Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203



DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING

Dear Lowell:

We have reviewed Genwal Coal Company's response to our conditions for approval of the Tract 2 Mine and Reclamation Plan set forth in our December 1, 1986, letter to OSM (attached).

Tract 2 Conditions (Letter of December 1, 1986)

The subject revisions to the Plan have adequately addressed items 1 - 11. Items 12 and 13 have not been addressed as follows:

Item 12: This item referred back to our November 15, 1986, letter to OSM regarding the Tract 1 Mid-Term Review (item 10). In this letter, we provided Forest Service instream flow claims for the mouth of Crandall Creek. This claim is the minimum instream flow needed for the purposes of the National Forest at that point. Genwal Coal Company needs to extrapolate the minimum instream flow, as shown in item 6 of the claim, to their point of diversion, subject to review by the Forest Service and State. While water diversion is occurring, the minimum instream flow must be allowed to pass the point of diversion.

Treatment of the road for dust suppression and water use must be discussed in the Mine and Reclamation Plan.

Item 13: The presence or absence of the sensitive plant Hedysarum occidentale var. canone in the permit area must be confirmed. If it is found to grow within the permit area, it must be mapped and identified for protection.

Sediment Pond (Letter of April 14, 1987)

A copy of our April 14, 1987, letter to Andy King of Genwal Coal Company regarding the sediment pond was attached with Genwal's response. A copy is attached for reference. Genwal Coal Company must include items 2 and 3 in the Mine and Reclamation Plan. As discussed in item 1, a field review of Section C-C was conducted by the Forest. The potential for "drag effect" failure was determined to be low, therefore, removal of the natural steep embankment will not be necessary.

Mid-Term Review, Tract 1 (Letter of November 15, 1986)

We have not received a response regarding our comments on the Tract 1 Mid-Term Review that were identified in our November 15, 1986, letter.

If you have any questions, please contact us.

Sincerely,

for

A. J. FRANDSEN

Acting Forest Supervisor

Enclosures